DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 686 CG 023 662

AUTHOR Dole, Arthur A.; And Others
TITLE Belief Structures about People Held by Selected Graduate Students.
PUB DATE 18 Aug 91
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (99th, San Francisco, CA, August 16-20, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beliefs; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Individual Psychology; *Personality; Theories; Validity

ABSTRACT

Wrightsman has established that assumptions about human nature distinguish religious, occupational, political, gender, and other groups, and that they predict behavior in structured situations. Hjelle and Ziegler proposed a set of nine basic bipolar assumptions about the nature of people: freedom-determinism; rationality-irrationality; holism-elementalism; constitutionalism-environmentalism; changeability-unchangeability; subjectivity-objectivity; proactivity-reactivity; homeostasis-heterostasis; and knowability-unknowability. To test Hjelle and Ziegler's approach empirically as it applied to behavioral specialists, Dole and Woodruff developed an inventory which they administered to beginning graduate students. Thomas Sowell, a conservative political theorist, has proposed that two distinctive world views contribute to conflicts. For those with a constrained vision "man" is unchanging. Those with an unconstrained vision assume that "man" is intentional and rational. A 30-item inventory, the Conflict of Visions (COV) Inventory, was constructed to test whether or not graduate students in psychology would support Sowell's bipolar assumptions about people. This inventory, along with the Beliefs about People (BAP) inventory were administered to 107 graduate students in psychology and related areas. Item analyses of BAP only partially supported bipolar assumptions. After BAP and COV were each factor analyzed, component scores were identified and correlated. The results indicated that beliefs about people, grounded in an essentially political/philosophical paradigm, were largely independent of the assumptions of great psychologists. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336686

Belief Structures about People Held by Selected Graduate Students

Arthur A. Dole, Andrew R. Baggaley, and George Woodruff

University of Pennsylvania

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, August 18,1991.

Running head: Beliefs

CG023662

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Arthur A. Dole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

Beliefs about People (BAP), a 46 item inventory, was used to test bipolar assumptions about personality and to relate belief structures grounded in the teachings of great psychologists to those based on a political/social paradigm, proposed by Sowell, and measured by a 30 item inventory, Conflict of Visions (COV). For 107 selected graduate students mostly in academic psychology, item analyses of BAP only partially supported bipolar assumptions. After BAP and COV were each factor analyzed, component scores were identified and correlated. Since only 4 of 25 correlations were significant ($p < .05$), it was concluded that beliefs about people, grounded in an essentially political/philosophical paradigm, were largely independent of the assumptions of great psychologists.

Belief Structures about People Held by

Selected Graduate Students

In this exploratory study we report on certain belief structures about people held by selected graduate students in psychology. Basic notions about others are particularly interesting among those who are preparing to become specialists themselves in human nature. To what extent do they subscribe to the central assumptions of Freud, Skinner, Rogers and other influential theoreticians in respect to people's goodness, rationality, etc? From their perspective are the assumptions held by great psychologists related to those underlying a contemporary system of political thought? Do their belief structures conform to bipolar dimensions?

Theorists' Beliefs

Wrightsman

Wrightsman (1974) has established that assumptions about human nature distinguish religious, occupational, political, gender and other groups and that they predict behavior in structured situations. Of relevance to the present study, Dole, Nottingham, and Wrightsman (1969) compared national samples of graduate students in counseling, clinical and rehabilitation psychology on the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (PHN). They concluded that these three mental health subspecialties shared a common goal in regard to their beliefs about the nature of people.

Hjelle and Ziegler

Whereas Wrightsman grounded his work, including his PHN scale, on the great philosophers (e.g. Plato, Aristotle, Marx, Rousseau, Hegel, Darwin,) plus major psychologists and sociologists, Hjelle and Ziegler (1981) in their text on personality theories concentrated on 10 seminal figures in psychology and psychiatry--Freud, George Kelly, Maslow, Rogers, Adler, Erikson, Murray, Skinner, Bandura, and Gordon Allport. They proposed a set of nine basic *bipolar* assumptions about the nature of people: freedom-determinism;rationality-irrationality; holism-elementalism; constitutionalism-environmentalism; changability-unchangability; subjectivity-objectivity; proactivity-reactivity; homeostasis-heterostasis; and knowability-unknowability. "We are convinced that all major theories of

personality are built upon different positions on these major assumptions . . . portrayed here as relatively continuous, bipolar dimensions . . ." (p. 13). To test Hjelle and Ziegler's approach empirically as it applied to behavioral specialists, Dole and Woodruff (1988) developed an inventory which they administered to 35 selected beginning graduate students. On the bases of item and factor analyses, they concluded that the particular group of students supported only to a limited extent the hypothesized bipolar scheme.

Sowell

Thomas Sowell, a conservative political theorist, has proposed in his book, *A conflict of visions* (1987), that two distinctive world views contribute to conflicts. A vision is "a preanalytic cognitive act." For those with a Constrained vision "man" is unchanging. Those with an Unconstrained vision assume that "man" is intentional and rational. Thus, constrained Marxists argue past unconstrained advocates of social responsibility. We constructed a 30 item inventory, Conflict of Visions (COV), based on statements in his book, to test through factor analysis whether or not graduate students in psychology would support Sowell's bipolar assumptions about people.

Research Questions

In the present study we administered the COV and a revised version of Dole and Woodruff's instrument, Beliefs about People (BAP), to a diverse group of graduate students, representing academic and professional psychology. We addressed the following questions with respect to the BAP: Which beliefs about people were most popular? Which bipolar dimensions, if any, were supported by item and factor analyses? To what extent, if any, were factorially derived component scores related to selected characteristics: age, gender, academic vs. professional major, work setting, work functions, and theoretical orientation?

With respect to COV, to what extent for these students would their political belief structure conform to Sowell's assumptions about bipolarity and to what extent would factorially derived component scores be related to BAP and to selected characteristics? Judging by Woodruff and Dole (1988) and pilot studies, we expected to find that graduate students would only partially conform to bipolarity in thinking about others, that their beliefs would tend to be associated with other characteristics, and that psychological and political belief structures would be largely independent.

Method

Design

To identify relationships among expressed beliefs we employed a correlational design. Except for selected characteristics of the participants,we focused on items presented in the two questionnaires.

Participants

One hundred and seven graduate students in psychology and related areas provided usable responses to BAP and COV. The typical respondent was a thirtysomething female college graduate, a candidate for a master's degree with aspirations for a teaching or research poition in an educational setting. She described herself as eclectic in theoretical orientation and listed Abraham Maslow as most admired psychologist.

Setting

The psychology program was housed in a graduate school of education at a selective, private, national research university. The program offered master's and doctoral specializations in human learning and development, measurement and statistics, and professional psychology (APA approved).

Measures

Beliefs About People (BAP) was designed to survey the basic assumptions about others of mental health specialists. For each of 46 statements, respondents are asked to ..."mark 1 if you think it applies to almost everyone you know almost all of the time;2 if it applies to the majority of people; 3 if it applies to about half of people; 4 if it applies to just a few people; and 5 if it applies to almost no one with whom you are acquainted under most circumstances." (See Appendix for full directions.) Evidence about construct validity, factor structure, and internal consistency have been collected in a series of prelimary studies. Following the Dole and Woodruff (1988) study of beginning psychology graduate students, we administered revised forms and interviewed a number of students and academic and professional psychologists. It was evident that the items reflected known diversity in beliefs among these psychologists. Of the 46 items in the present form, 18 were written to describe each extreme of the 9 bipolar dimensions proposed by Hjelle and Ziegler (1981); 8 described each extreme of 4 PHN scales (Wrightsman,1979); and 12 paired items were based on a variety of sources. For example, "About how many people....are predisposed genetically to violence." which was paired with ..."are generally peaceful in most situations," was adapted from the Saville statement denying

that humans are biologically predisposed to violence. In addition, we wrote 8 miscellaneous marker items.

To appraise political/social values in contemporary society we adopted Sowell's bipolar, Constrained vs. Unconstrained, conceptualizations about human nature and designed the Conflict of Visions (COV) questionnaire. Twenty six statements were written that involved some rewording of material from Sowell's book. In addition, four statements from Wrightsman (1979) were designed as "anchors" to identify new factors--two loaded on Wrightsman's Cynicism factor and two on his Conventional Goodness" factor. Respondents were asked to "indicate the extent to which you agree" with each of the 30 statements on a six step Likert scale: agree strongly; agree somewhat; agree slightly; disagree slightly; disagree somewhat; disagree strongly. In addition, each subject reported age, gender, academic vs. practitioner specialization, work setting, work functions, and preference, plus optional items on religious preference and ethnic ancestry.

Procedure

The surveys were administered under conditions of anonymity to students in a variety of introductory and advanced graduate courses in academic and professional psychology. Since no attempt was made to select a representative group, generalizatons to other groups must be limited.

Analyses

After item means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations were calculated for BAP, two criteria of bipolarity were applied to item pairs: (a) negative correlation $P < .05$, and (b) Effect Size, when $\frac{M_1 - M_2}{\frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}{2}}$ exceeds 0.99.

A principal-components analysis was performed on the data of BAP and COV separately and component scales were defined. The BAP components were then correlated with those of COV and with selected characteristics. Because of extreme skewness religious preference and ethnicity could not be correlated.

Results and Discussion

Most and Least Popular Beliefs

This particular group of psychologists-to-be endorsed 10 items (Table 1) as applying to the majority or almost everyone of those with whom they were familiar. They believed that on average in general in typical situations most people "are best understood by studying their behavior in its totality," "are rather complicated," "have a number of enduring characteristics or traits," "share certain basic, universal characteristics," yet "are each almost completely unique," " live in a highly personal, subjective world of experience that is a major influence upon their behavior," " conform to group pessures," "are peaceful" and "free" "pretty consistently." The emphasis on freedom, holism, and subjectivity is consistent with the thinking of Rogers, Adler, and Maslow (Hjelle and Ziegler, 1981). The Saville statement on violence was supported.

In contrast, these graduate students indicated that seven statements applied to almost no one or to a few people. In their opinion most people were not "fundamentally evil," "predisposed genetically to violence," or "fully knowable in scientific terms;" generally people can not "be explained...by investigating each specific, fundamental aspect of their behavior independent of the rest."They denied that people "usually can't be trusted," "are pretty simple to understand," and "tend to act rather inconsistently across similar situations." Although they attended a university which was close to an urban high crime area, they held a positive view of others Apparently this group was not enthusiastic about the elementalism associated especially with Skinner.

Bipolar Dimensions

When each of 19 paired items on the BAP, written to represent bipolar dimensions, were examined,7 satisfied our formula for an important effect size (Table 2). The items describing Rationality-Irrationality, Holism-Elementalism, Knowability-Unkowability, Trustworthiness-Untrustworthiness, Complexity-Simplicity, Evil-Good, and Consistent-Inconsistent were moderately and significantly correlated and their means differed by at least one standard deviation. In addition, three pairs--Changeability-Unchangeability, Altruism-Selfishness, Predictable-Unpredictable--yielded significant negative and moderate correlations, although the difference between the means was less than half a standard deviation. And three pairs--Subjectivity-Objectivity, Types-Traits, and Violent-Peaceful--yielded substantial differences between the means but

Table 1

Most and Least Supported Beliefs About People (N = 107)

	X	S.D.
Applies to Majority or Almost Everyone		
...are best understood by studying their behavior in its totality.	1.88	1.11
...in general are rather complicated.	1.88	1.11
...have a number of enduring characteristics or traits which ordinarily distinguish them from others.	1.97	0.92
...share certain basic,universal characteristics.	2.09	1.10
...are each almost completely unique, like no other person.	2.16	1.35
...generally live in a highly personal, subjective world of experience that is a major influence upon their behavior.	2.22	0.99
...usually conform to group pressure.	2.27	0.76
...are generally peaceful in most situations.	2.34	0.78
...are free; that is, are able to control their everyday behavior most of the time.	2.51	0.99
...behave pretty consistently across similar situations.	2.52	0.77
Applies to Almost No One or a Few		
...are fundamentally evil.	4.47	0.86
...are predisposed genetically to violence.	4.42	0.89
...are fully knowable in scientific terms.	4.32	0.88
...generally can be explained only by investigating each specific, fundamental aspect of their behavior independent of the rest.	4.32	0.93
...usually can't be trusted.	3.97	0.80
...as a rule are pretty simple to understand.	3.92	1.10
...tend to act rather inconsistently across similar situations	3.79	0.75

Note. Graduate students were asked for each item "about how many people" on a scale from almost everyone, (1); majority (2); about half (3); a few (4); to almost no one (5). Most endorsed items averaged 2.60 or above; least endorsed 3.80 or below.

low non significant correlations. Four of the nine dimensions posited by Hjelle and Ziegler (1981) and one of the four proposed by Wrightsman(1974) did not meet either the correlational or effect size criteria.

Thus, when these findings are compared with those of Dole and Woodruff (1988) on a preliminary form of BAP admistered to first year graduate students in psychological services, the overall conclusion is supported. The bipolar assumptions about human nature proposed by Hjelle and Ziegler (1981) were only partially confirmed. However, detailed results of the two studies were not duplicated completely perhaps because of sample differences or inadequate items. Written and interview comments suggest that some apparent opposites designed by experts were not contradictory in the view of the respondents.

Factors on BAP

We consider factor analysis as a more sophisticated test of the bipolarity theory as well as a strategy to identify item patterns. For these graduate students BAP yielded five factors (Table 3). Good-Evil included at one pole items describing people as selfish, predisposed to violence, and can't be trusted; items loading negatively characterized others as good, trustworthy, peaceful in most situations, and basically unselfish. This factor includes Wrightsman's bipolar Altruism-Selfishness (Table 2). Predictable-Unpredictable grouped at the positive pole items describing people as sharing certain basic universal characteristics, highly predictable, having "traits which ordinarily distinguish them from others"; in contrast were items which depicted others as difficult to predict, differing in their basic natures, acting inconsistently and varying in personality. The factor we named Subjective Control might represent a Freudian perspective. People are believed to live in a highly subjective world, influenced by unconscious forces beyong their control and environment. Free Will factor loaded on items indicating that people are able to change by themselves throughout life, understand their own motives and are rational,self-actualizing, and "able to control their everyday behavior most of the time." This factor seems consistent with the basic beliefs of Rogers, Adler and Maslow. Items loading on the Simplistic factor describe others as "generally can be explained only by investigating each specific, fundamental aspect of their behavior independent of the rest," "pretty simple to understand," "usually react simply as a series of responses...," and "can best be classified into types." This perspective seems consistent with Skinner and with contemporary typologists. Whereas only two of these factors were bipolar, Dole and Woodruff (1988) extracted five bipolar factors out of six and their item loadings differed. We conclude that patterns on the BAP are unstable and not consistently bipolar, and possibly may vary depending on sample characteristics.

Means, Correlations, and Effect Sizes--Bipolar Dimensions (N=107)

Dimension	x	r	Opposite	x	ES
Freedom (HJ)	2.57 (0.99)	-.02	Determinism	3.11 (1.18)	0.50
Rationality (HJ)	2.70 (0.95)	-.26**	Irrationality	3.66 (0.90)	1.04
Holism (HJ)	1.88 (1.11)	-.27**	Elementalism	4.32 (0.93)	2.39
Constitutionalism (HJ)	3.62 (1.04)	.04	Environmentalism	2.79 (0.97)	0.83
Changeability (HJ)	2.74 (1.04)	-.38**	Unchangeability	2.91 (0.97)	0.17
Subjectivity (HJ)	2.22 (0.99)	-.09	Objectivity	3.36 (1.05)	1.12
Proactivity (HJ)	2.95 (1.07)	-.10	Reactivity	3.61 (1.09)	0.61
Homeostasis (HJ)	2.60 (1.11)	-.05	Heterostasis	2.91 (0.93)	0.30
Knowability (HJ)	4.32 (0.86)	-.22*	Unknowability	2.92 (1.16)	1.39
Trustworthiness (W)	2.63 (0.88)	-.35**	Untrustworthiness	3.97 (0.80)	1.60
Altruism (W)	3.27 (0.89)	-.45**	Selfishness	3.69 (0.86)	0.48
Independence (W)	2.90 (0.79)	-.17	Conformity	2.27 (0.71)	0.84
Complexity (W)	1.88 (1.11)	-.37**	Simplicity	3.92 (1.10)	1.77
Predictable (A)	3.00 (0.96)	-.36**	Unpredictable	3.38 (0.98)	0.39
Types (A)	3.17 (1.09)	.04	Traits	1.97 (0.92)	1.20
Unique (A)	2.16 (1.35)	-.10	Alike	3.22 (1.24)	0.82
Evil (A)	4.47 (0.86)	-.40**	Good	2.18 (0.78)	2.79
Violent (A)	4.42 (0.89)	-.11	Peaceful	2.34 (0.79)	2.48
Consistent (A)	2.52 (0.77)	-.40**	Inconsistent	3.79 (0.75)	1.67

*=p <.05 **= p <.01

Note. Scale was coded as almost every one (1); majority(2); about half(3);a few (4);almost no one (5). Sources of items representing bipolar dimensions are indicated as follows: (HJ)--Hjelle and Ziegler (1981), (W) Wrightsman (1979), and (A)--the authors. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Factor Loadings for Beliefs About People (N = 107)

Item		Loading
	Factor I: Good-Evil	
34	...at bottom are selfish, unconcerned about others.	.676
30	...are predisposed genetically to violence.	.610
31	...usually can't be trusted.	.604
25	...are fundamentally evil.	.532
41	...are easily manipulated in most situations.	.446
2	...are principally directed by irrational forces.	.424
37	...show strength of will under most circumstances.	-.483
32	...are basically unselfish, sincerely interested in others.	-.561
36	...are generally peaceful in most situations.	-.592
19	...are trustworthy in most situations.	-.661
35	...are good, if given half a chance.	-.711
	Factor II: Predictable-Unpredictabled	
28	...share certain basic, universal characteristics.	.546
21	...are highly predictable, given sufficient information.	.532
23	...have a number of enduring characteristics or traits which ordinarily distinguish them from others.	.432
5	...basically stay pretty much as they are over time.	.427
39	...behave pretty consistently across similar situations.	.410
42	...vary in their personality depending on the situation.	-.418
46	...tend to act rather inconsistently across similar situations	-.468
38	...differ in their basic natures.	-.563
27	...are usually difficult to predict even if you know them.	-.583
	Factor III: Subjective Control	
6	...generally live in a highly personal, subjective world of experience that is a major influence upon their behavior.	.647
9	...are typically influenced by factors that are partially or totally outside the sphere of their conscious recognition.	.635
43	...typically are shaped by forces beyong their control.	.610
13	...by and large usually behave as they do because of environmental influences.	.535

33	...usually conform to group pressure.	

Factor IV: Free Will

44	...are able to change by themselves when circumstances make it necessary.	.607
14	...in most instances are capable of fundamental change throughout life.	.590
40	...understand the motives behind their own behavior most of the time.	.565
17	...are basically motivated toward growth, stimulus seeking, and self actualization.	.539
11	...are rational beings who direct their behavior through reason in most situations.	.502
18	...are fully knowable in scientific terms.	.485
37	...show strength of will in most circumstances.	.421
1	...are free; that, are able to control their everyday behavior most of the time.	.404

Factor V: Simplicity

12	...generally can be explained only by investigating each specific, fundamental aspect of their behavior independent of the rest.	.627
26	....as a rule are pretty simple to understand.	.599
7	...usually react simply as a series of responses to external stimuli.	.588
22	...can best be classified into types.	.499
15	...are usually influenced primarily, if not exclusively, by external , objective factors.	.479

BAP vs. Selected Characteristics

By treating the BAP five factors as component scores and correlating them with selected characteristics of these graduate students, we reasoned that we would be able to shed further light on the relation of belief structures to various attributes and to identify attributes for further study. According to Table 4, bearing in mind that a low score represents a larger number of people than a high one, younger people were more likely to score high on the Unpredicability dimension, and female respondents stressed Goodness. Time spent in administrative functions was associated with Simplistic beliefs; on the other hand, the more time respondents reported they spent in instruction the lower their scores on Subjectivity; research was negatively correlated with Freedom; that is, the more the respondents were involved in research the less likely they were to see others ("subjects?") as controling their destinies. Self-styled eclectics scored higher on Subjectivity and Simplistic, whereas humanists were negatively associated with the Simplistic factor, and a dynamic theoretical orientation was negatively correlated with Subjectivity. In other words, consistent with what might be expected, eclectics were more likely to reject subjective and simplistic views of human nature; humanists rejected simplistic conceptions; and those with a dynamic orientation stressed subjective aspects of human nature. BAP component scores were independent of discipline and primary work setting. Although the correlations of BAP factors with characteristcs tended to be low and more often than not non-significant, age, gender, theoretical orientation, and work settings and functions probably need to be accounted for in further research. Religious preference, ethnic background, political affiliation, and personality ratings come to mind as other variables which may be associated with belief structures about people.

Conflict of Visions

After a principal-component analysis was performed on the COV data, five factors were retained for varimax rotation on the basis of percentage of total variance accounted for and meaningfulness. Table 5 shows the highly loaded statement on these factors. The first factor was named Utopianism. The flavor of this factor can be discerned from the second and third highest loading statements, "Evil in existing society is not very difficult to cure when one has diagnosed it scientifically" and "Human beings can come nearer and nearer to perfectability." Two of the four highest loading statements on the second factor were from Wrightsman's Cynicism factor: "Most people would tell a lie if they could gain from it," and " People claim that they have ethical stamdards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down."

Table 4

Correlations of Beliefs About People with Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	N	Beliefs About People				
		Good	Pred	Subj	Free	Simpl
Age	86	-04	-19*	-14	03	-05
Gender	92	-21**	-10	08	02	15
Discipline	88					
Professional psychology		-18	00	03	05	04
Academic psychology		09	01	-05	16	03
Other than psychology		10	-01	02	-17	-07
% of time spent in--	78					
Administration		04	-04	12	-01	-32**
Assessment		-06	-06	13	09	02
Counseling		-03	-12	-01	06	03
Instruction		-03	13	-26**	09	-04
Research		03	00	-03	-26**	09
Other		01	01	05	11	16
Theoretical orientation	72					
Eclectic		-08	13	22*	07	38**
Humanistic		-11	-06	-06	06	-32**
Cognitive/behavioral		20	-08	-01	-17	-14
Dynamic		-07	09	-22*	17	-04
Primary work setting	67					
Higher education		-05	04	-04	04	-12
Elementary/secondary ed		11	14	-03	01	-06
Community		-13	-09	-01	11	19
Other		-10	-04	-01	-04	-01

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 5

Factor Analysis of Conflict of Visions (N = 97)

Item		Mean	S.D.	Loading
	Utopianism			
13	The law should represent largely the articulation of previously existing practices.	2.76	1.55	+.70
10	Evil in existing society is not very difficult to cure when one has diagnosed it scientically.	1.90	1.37	+.66
11	Human beings can come nearer and nearer to perfectability.	3.26	1.94	+.61
14	A few intellectual and moral pioneers should lead their contemporaries toward higher and higher levels of understanding and practice.	3.98	1.94	+.55
6	The strategies that restrain or ameliorate human evils will themselves have costs.	5.39	1.44	-.51
	Cynicism			
17	Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.	4.00	1.77	+.62
3	If decency has not been created in the malleable years of childhood it is unlikely to be created later.	4.18	1.87	+.57
30	The fact that some unworthy persons succeed in life and some fail is unavoidable in any free society.	5.45	1.67	+.56
8	People claim that they have ethical standards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.	4.02	1.79	+.53
18	The best conduct of social activities depends on special knowledge of the few being used to guide the actions of the many.	2.99	1.60	+.50
12	Equality should mean equal treatment of individuals but not necessarily equal outcome for them.	4.90	1.82	+.41
16	Attempts to equalize economic results for people tend to lead to greater inequality in power.	3.83	1.76	+.39
2	People should do right things just because they are right,not because of psychic or economic rewards.	5.11	1.80	+.37
27	In dealing with human problems, we must deal more with tradeoffs than solutions.	4.28	1.80	+.37

Conventional Goodness

5	Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.	3.43	1.75	+.71
29	Most people try to apply the Golden Rule, even in today's complex society.	4.55	1.64	+.57
28	Progress involves raising the conclusions of persons of narrow views to the level of those with cultivated minds.	4.10	1.79	+.51
9	The person who lacks the means of achieving his or her goals is not really free.	4.38	2.01	+.50
7	In many instances injustice is inevitable, and the only real question is whether there will be more with one process than with another.	5.01	1.61	+.37

Paranoid Outlook

23	The best is the enemy of the good.	2.66	1.43	+.69
1	The "wisdom of the ages" comprises largely the illusions of the ignorant.	2.60	1.41	+.53
20	Foolish or immoral choices explain the evils of the world.	3.00	1.72	+.49
15	Basically good human nature has been corrupted by social institutions.	3.57	1.66	+.44
24	The law arises from the evolved and codified experience of vast numbers of people rather than deliberate, logical creation by great minds.	4.36	1.73	+.40

Affirmative Action

22	The phrase "social justice" is used by many to imply that one ought to agree to a demand by some special interest group which can give no real reason for it.	2.77	1.63	-.72
21	Compensatory advantages should be provided to persons whose social backgrounds handicap them them in competition with others.	4.65	1.61	+.71
26	A more equal society is a better society, even if its citizens prefer inequality.	4.35	1.75	+.50

Note. Response scale was coded as agree strongly (6), agree somewnat (5), agree slightly (4), disagree slightly (3), disagree somewhat (2), and disagreek strongly (1).

Similarly, the two statements from Wrightsman's Conventional Goodness factor loaded highly on the third factor: "Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble" and "Most people try to apply the Golden Rule, even in today's complex society." The fourth factor seemed to suggest a Paranoid Outlook, as evidenced by highly loading statements like "Foolish or immoral choices explain the evils of the world" and "Basically good human nature has been corrupted by social institutions." The fifth factor had few highly loaded statements, but these suggest support for Affirmative Action; for example "Compensatory advantages should be provided to persons whose social backgrounds handicap them in competition with others" and "The phrase 'social justice' is used by many to imply that one ought to agree to a demand by some special interest group which can give no real reason for it" (negatively loaded).

Of the five COV factors, two were bipolar--Utopianism and Affirmative Action. However, Sowell's conceptualization of Realistic-Unrealistic seems overly simplistic for this group.

COV vs. Selected Characteristics

For each factor a unit-weighted composite was generated using the highly loading statements as components. These composites were correlated with selected characteristics of the respondents, treated as classification variables: age, gender, academic discipline, percentage of time spent in various work activities, theoretical orientation, and primary work setting (Table 6). The N's for these correlations varied because some of the questions were not answered by some respondents (often because of inapplicability). (Note further that one class which responded to BAP did not take COV.)

Utopianism showed the most correlation with the classification variables. Females and those involved in counseling or therapy scored significantly higher on Utopianism. One might think that this relationship reflects the predominance of females in this activity. However, the correlation between femaleness and counseling was -.03; thus the two variables seem to operate independently. Persons working in elementary and secondary schools scored significantly higher and those in psychology lower on Utopianism. Respondents with a theoretical orientation of cognitive/ behavioral scored higher, while those with humanistic orientation scored lower on Utopianism.

Cynicism and Goodness showed no significant correlations with the classification variables. Persons with a humanistic orientation scored significantly higher on Paranoid Outlook and lower on Affirmative Action.

COV vs. BAP

When the five component COV scores and the five component BAP scores were intercorrelated (Table 7), for the most part the two measures were independent. Of 25 correlations between COV and BAP, 4 were significant but moderate: Good-Evil with Paranoia, Predictable-Unpredictable negatively with Utopianism,Free Will with Utopianism and Simplistic with Goodness.

Considering these significant ($p < .05$) correlations in order of their magnitude, we offer the following interpretations. Free Will vs. Utopianism ($r = .28$) may mean that people who believe that others can control their own destiny may believe also that their techniques can produce human perfection. Simplistic vs. Goodness ($r = .26$) may mean that people who consider others easy to understand also support conventional goodness. Note that the two highest loaded items on Goodness were taken from Wrightsman's PHN. Good-Evil vs. Paranoia ($r = .20$) may mean that those who tend to see the worst in others also harbor Rousseauian suspicions. Predicability-Unpredictability vs. Utopianism ($r = -.20$) may mean that those who tend to view others as inconsistent are less likely to support idealistic visions.

Some redundancy was found when the five COV components were correlated with one another. Cynicism, Utopianism, Goodness, and Paranoia were moderately but significantly associated. However, except for a moderate ($r = -.38$) negative relationship between Free Will and Good-Evil, none of the BAP components was significantly correlated with another component.In sum, our findings suggest that beliefs about people, grounded in an essentially political/philosophical paradigm, are for the most part independent of beliefs based on the thinking of psychologists.

Concluding Comments

This group of graduate students in psychology tended to report beliefs about people that were consistent with the findings of Wrightsman (1974) some years ago. Our data for a predominantly academic group confirmed the results of the more recent study by Dole and Woodruff (1988) for a practitioner graduate group. That is, the bipolar dimensions proposed by Hjelle and Ziegler (1981) were only partially suported whether tested by comparing item pairs or by factor analysis. Similarly, the bipolar Realistic-Unrealistic political/social dimension proposed by Thomas Sowell(1987) seemed better described by five factors or patterns which were largely

Table 6

Correlations of Conflict of Visions with Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	N	Utop-ian	Cynic ism	Good ness	Para-noid	Affirm action
Age	77	11	-10	04	-19*	-19*
Gender	82	-20*	-08	-06	-03	13
Discipline	81					
Professional psychology		15	-13	03	-04	-05
Academic psychology		06	08	-07	03	11
Other than psychology		-19*	06	02	01	-04
% of time spent in--	70					
Administration		-01	15	-19	08	00
Assessment		02	-13	-13	17	05
Counseling		24**	-09	09	-10	05
Instruction		-11	08	00	-13	-10
Research		-02	00	-02	09	03
Other		-08	-08	12	00	01
Theoretical orientation	64					
Eclectic		06	-05	01	-19	22
Humanistic		-25*	13	05	34**	-30*
Cognitive/behavioral		25*	03	05	-05	-12
Dynamic		-01	-08	07	-05	-12
Primary work setting	77					
Higher education		-01	13	-02	-01	10
Elementary/secondary ed		25*	07	-08	-04	-10
Community		-21*	-10	-16	-11	-15
Other		20	-07	17	19	14

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 7

Intercorrelations: Beliefs About People and Conflict of Visions (n = 97)

	Conflict of Visions				
Conflict of Visions	Utopianism	Cynicism	Goodness	Paranoia	Affirm Act
Utopianism	1.00				
Cynicism	.20*	1.00			
Goodness	.24*	.20*	1.00		
Paranoia	.25*	.21*	.26*	1.00	
Affirmative Action	-.05	-.05	.04	-.03	1.00
Beliefs About People					
Good-Evil	-.06	.18	-.08	.20*	.04
Predictable-Unpred	-.20*	.00	.17	.11	.10
Subjective Control	-.09	.02	.06	.07	.14
Free will	.28**	-.08	.09	.08	.02
Simplistic	.12	.13	.26**	.18	-.04

	Beliefs About People				
Beliefs About People	Good-Evil	Predictable	Subjective	Free Will	Simple
Good-Evil	1.00				
Predictable-Unpred	-.07	1.00			
Subjective Control	.17	-.03	1.00		
Free Will	-.38**	.08	.17	1.00	
Simple	.11	.16	.00	.05	1.00

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .05$

Note. Since on BAP a low score indicated agreement that statement applied to most people, we reversed the algebraic sign of all cross-correlations with COV.

independent of five components, measuring psychologists' beliefs about people.

Although our sample was selected and relatively small, we propose tentatively that the belief systems about human behavior of those intending to become specialists are of interest in their own right. Our preliminary findings also suggest that in further studies the BAP may have value in the education of psychologists and in attaining new perspectives on the basic assumptions of psychological specialists.

References

Dole, A.A., & Woodruff, G. (1988). Beliefs about people held by first year graduates in professional psychology. Paper presented at the XXIV Congress of Psychology, Sydney, Australia.

Hjelle, L.A., & Ziegler, D.J. (1981). Personality theories. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sowell, T. (1987). A conflict of visions. New York: Morrow.

Wrightsman, L.S. (1974). Assumptions about human nature: A social psychological approach. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.